

REMARKS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application. No claims are added in this response. Claims 9, 13, 52, and 53 are cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 39 are amended. Therefore claims 1, 4-7, 10, 14-16, 19, 20, 24-26, 39-43, 46, and 48-50 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims in view of the amendments.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Examiner objects to claims 1, 7, 10, 39, and 46 because of informalities. Office Action, p. 4, item 2. Applicants amend the claims to clarify that the combination of identities is the combination of identities of a user and of a mobile client of the user. The objected to term “user station” is no longer recited in the claims. The amendment is supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, p. 9, lines 12-13; p. 10, lines 7-10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the claim objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

- Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-6, 39-42, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,176 of Stewart (hereinafter "Stewart") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,493,755 of Genty (hereinafter “Genty”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,194,554 of Short (hereinafter “Short”). Office Action, p. 5, item 3.
- Examiner rejects claims 7 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty and Short, further in view of Funk Software, “Comprehensive RADIUS/AAA Solution for the global Enterprise”, February 22, 2003, pages 1-6 (hereinafter “Funk”). Office Action, p. 11, item 4.
- Examiner rejects claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty and Short, further in view of U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2002/0055924 of Liming (hereinafter “Liming”). Office Action, p. 12, item 5.

- Examiner rejects claims 9, 10, 13-16, 19, 24, and 52-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty and Short, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149443 of Torvinen (hereinafter “Torvinen”). Office Action, p. 13, item 6.
- Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short and Torvinen, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0255154 of Kwan (hereinafter “Kwan”). Office Action, p. 21, item 7.
- Examiner rejects claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short and Torvinen, further in view of Funk. Office Action, p. 21, item 8.
- Examiner rejects claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, and Torvinen, and further in view of Liming. Office Action, p. 23, item 9.
- Examiner rejects claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, and Torvinen, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045451 of Tan (hereinafter “Tan”). Office Action, p. 24, item 10.

Applicants amend claim 1, which is reproduced below. Claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations.

Claim 1 as amended recites the following:

A method of controlling access to a network, the method comprising:
 configuring an authentication server to include a first location information corresponding to **a combination of identities of a user and of a mobile client of the user**, the first location information being a location at which the mobile client is permitted to connect to the network,
 wherein the authentication server is coupled to the network and comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, and
 wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes;
 requesting by a network switch the combination of identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user attempting to connect to the network;
 receiving, by the authentication server, the combination of identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user via the network switch;
 associating, by the network switch, a second location information corresponding to the mobile client with the combination of identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user, wherein the second location information indicates a location of the network switch coupled to the network to which the mobile client is attempting to connect;
 storing the second location information on the network switch;
 periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device, wherein the mobile client is operable to connect to the network via the edge device;
 authenticating, by the authentication server, the combination of identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user received by the authentication server;
 comparing, by the authentication server, the second location information corresponding to the mobile client against the first location information from the VSA;
 deciding, by the authentication server, whether to grant or deny access to the network for the mobile client in response to authenticating the combination of the identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user, wherein the deciding is in response to comparing the second location information against the first location information; and
 informing the network switch by the authentication server whether to grant or deny access to the network for the mobile client.

The amendments are supported by the Specification. See, for example,

Application Specification, p. 9, lines 12-13; p. 10, lines 7-10; 22-24.

“**All words in a claim must be considered** in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (emphasis added).

Regarding previously presented claim 9, now cancelled and incorporated into claim 1, Examiner admits that Stewart, Genty, and Short do not disclose periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device, wherein the mobile client is operable to connect to the network via the edge device. Office Action, p. 13, item 6. To cure this deficiency, Examiner relies on Torvinen. Id. Applicants contend that Torvinen does not cure the above deficiency.

Torvinen allegedly discloses a method and system that allows management of restricted group access based upon credentials associated with network terminals. Torvinen, Abstract. Examiner further cites paragraphs 27-28, 30, 42, 45, 54, and 58 of Torvinen to allege that Torvinen discloses the method of periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device, wherein the mobile client is operable to connect to the network via the edge device. Applicants contend that none of these cited paragraphs, or anywhere else in Torvinen, is there a method or disclosure of **periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device.**

Paragraph [0058] of Torvinen allegedly discloses quasi-open groups whose group access criteria can be altered dynamically. However, such alteration of group access **is not performed periodically** let alone that group access being equivalent to the second location information. The only place where the term “periodically” is disclosed in Torvinen is with respect to the BSIC (Base Transceiver Station Identity Code) which is broadcast periodically by the base station on the Synchronization Channel. Torvinen, paragraphs [0038-39]. However, such periodic broadcast is not the same as periodically

downloading the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider all words of the claim in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art, as required by M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Applicants also contend that the remaining references—Liming, Funk, and Tan—do not cure the deficiencies of Stewart, Genty, and Short. Liming, Funk, and Tan, alone or in combination, are not cited for rendering obvious the method or means of periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device, wherein the mobile client is operable to connect to the network via the edge device as recited by claim 1.

Liming, allegedly discloses a software and hardware architecture operating across a local or wide area network for providing an integral spatial location context. Liming, Abstract. Liming also discloses periodically prompting a user for current spatial location if a GPS or other location determination device can not be detected. Id. at par. 0101. However, such periodic prompting for a location is not the same as periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Funk allegedly discloses a RADIUS/AAA solution for global enterprise. Funk, Title. However, Funk does not disclose the method or means of periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Tan allegedly discloses a method and system for token based user access authentication to enable secure user access to a web server. Tan, Abstract. However, it does not disclose the method or means of periodically downloading the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Therefore, Liming, Funk, and Tan, alone or in combination, do not cure the deficiencies of Stewart, Genty, and Short.

Based on the above arguments and amendments, claim 1 is not obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations as claim 1. The

remaining claims depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 39 and include all limitations of their respective independent claims.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider all pending claims in view of the amendments and arguments. Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to call the undersigned should further clarification of the claims bring the claims to a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that they have overcome Examiner's objections to and rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as listed in the listing of claims. Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), Applicants request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

May 19, 2011

Date

/Usman A. Mughal/

Usman A. Mughal

Reg. No. 62,887

Attorney for Applicants

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: May 19, 2011

/Katherine R. Campbell/

Katherine R. Campbell